

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated November 24, 2009, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 29-39 and 41-53 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 29, 42, 45 and 48 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

At the outset, the Applicants thank Examiner Mered for making helpful suggestions in the Office Action for amending the claims to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

In the Office Action, claims 45-48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner indicates that the claims recite executable code or a program *per se*, which is non-statutory. In the Office Action, the Examiner suggests amending independent claim 45 to point out that the computer-readable storage medium is "non-transitory." The Examiner indicates that the suggested amendment would be sufficient to overcome the rejection to claims 45-48 under 35 U.S.C. 101.

The Applicants have amended independent claim 45, as suggested by the Examiner. The Applicants also respectfully point out that claims 46 and 47 depend from independent claim 45. However, claim 48 is an independent system claim and should not be grouped with claims 45-47 (which are directed to a program). Accordingly, no amendments are believed to be necessary for independent claim 48. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 45-48 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 29-39 and 41-53 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0029532, hereafter "Kato") in view of Sen et al. (article entitled "Internet Draft Midcom-unaware NAT/Firewall Traversal," April 2002, hereafter "Sen").

The Applicants have amended independent claims 29, 42, 45 and 48 to clearly distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art.

For example, independent claim 29 has been amended to point out that “said adjustment unit is operable to detect a longest response interval as the holding period in the router out of a plurality of response data sent by the server apparatus in response to the plurality of data sent by said terminal apparatus; and the corresponding relationship between the global address and the local address is always maintained as long as the terminal apparatus sends data packets to the router at the polling interval shorter than the holding period.”

The features emphasized above in independent claim 29 are similarly recited in independent claims 42, 45 and 48 (as amended). Additionally, the feature emphasized above in independent claim 29 (and similarly recited in independent claims 42, 45 and 48) are fully supported by the Applicants disclosure (see e.g., ¶ [0081]).

With the present invention (as recited in claims 29, 42, 45 and 48), an internet terminal sends a data packet every polling interval that is shorter than the holding period for the corresponding relationship stored in the router. The corresponding relationship stored in the router is between a global address assigned to the router and a local address of a terminal apparatus. Thus, it is possible for the router to always have the information necessary to convert from a global address into a local address, and thereby affect control of a home appliance during polling intervals.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Kato in view of Sen for disclosing all the features recited in independent claims 29, 42, 45 and 48. However, the Examiner also suggests claim amendments to the independent claims to clearly distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art.

More specifically, the Examiner suggests that the independent claims be amended to indicate that:

“said adjustment unit is operable to detect a longest response interval as the holding period in the router out of a plurality of response data sent by the server apparatus in response to the plurality of data sent by said terminal apparatus; and the corresponding relationship between the global address and the local address is always maintained as long as the terminal apparatus sends data packets to the router at the polling interval shorter than the holding period.”

The Examiner also indicates that "it is the position of the Examiner that the above stated feature distinguishes the Applicants' claimed invention from all of the previously cited prior art...." (see pg. 3, item 3).

As noted above, the Applicants have amended independent claims 29, 42, 45 and 48 to be identical to the amendments (noted above) suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Based on the above discussion, no combination of Kato and Sen would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claims 29, 42, 45 and 48 (as amended). Likewise, no combination of Kato and Sen would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 30-39, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47 and 49-53 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 29, 42, 45 and 48.

In light of the above, the Applicants submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass this application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuhiro AIZU et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By: 2010.02.16 14:25:40 -05'00'

Mark D. Pratt  
Registration No. 45,794  
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
February 16, 2010